

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP

Claude M. Stern (Bar No. 96737)

2 claudestern@quinnemanuel.com

Patrick Doolittle (Bar No. 203659)

3 patrickdoolittle@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

4 San Francisco, California 94111

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

5 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

6 Attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage PTE. Ltd

7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

10  
11 INTERSERVE, INC. dba TECHCRUNCH, a  
Delaware corporation, and CRUNCHPAD,  
12 INC., a Delaware corporation,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 FUSION GARAGE PTE. LTD, a Singapore  
company,

16 Defendant.  
17

CASE NO. C 09-cv-5812 JW (PVT)

**DECLARATION OF PATRICK  
DOOLITTLE IN SUPPORT OF FUSION  
GARAGE'S MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Date: March 16, 2010

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Patricia Trumbull

1 I, PATRICK C. DOOLITTLE declare as follows:

2 1. I am a member of the bar of the State of California and a partner in Quinn Emanuel  
3 Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP, attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage. Unless otherwise noted,  
4 I make this declaration of personal knowledge, and if called and sworn as a witness, I could and  
5 would testify competently thereto.

6 2. Shortly after the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for expedited discovery, I called  
7 David Bloch, counsel for Plaintiffs. I believe I called him the day after the Court issued its order  
8 granting in part and denying in part Plaintiffs' motion for expedited discovery. I asked that  
9 Plaintiffs identify the trade secrets that they alleged were misappropriated prior to taking  
10 discovery regarding the Defendant's trade secrets. Plaintiffs' counsel's position was that Code of  
11 Civil Procedure 2019.210 did not apply because they were not alleging a trade secrets claim.  
12 Accordingly, he declined to identify Plaintiffs' trade secrets.

13 3. Plaintiffs have now served two sets of requests for production and one set of  
14 interrogatories on Defendant Fusion Garage. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's First Set of  
15 Requests for Production is attached hereto as Exhibit A. A true and correct copy of Plaintiffs'  
16 First Set of Interrogatories is attached hereto as Exhibit B. A true and correct copy of Plaintiffs'  
17 Second Set of Requests for Production is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

18 4. Among the requests for production that Plaintiffs have served are the following:

19 ***Request for Production No. 13:*** All documents concerning the design,  
20 development or writing of software for the JooJoo.

21 ***Request for Production No. 15:*** All documents concerning the design of the  
22 JooJoo, including but not limited to industrial design, hardware, software, feature  
23 set, and user interface.

24 ***Request for Production No. 20:*** All documents concerning user documentation  
25 for the JooJoo.

26 ***Request for Production No. 24:*** All documents concerning plans for the  
27 development, design, manufacturing, marketing, advertising and promotion, and  
28 distribution of the JooJoo.

***Request for Production No. 33:*** All documents evidencing or concerning  
communications concerning intellectual property in the JooJoo.

***Request for Production No. 38:*** A complete copy of all versions of the source  
codes, object codes, and executables for the JooJoo.

That defined term, however, appears designed to encompass Fusion Garage’s product. The definition reads “The term ‘CrunchPad’ means any conception, version or prototype of the touch-screen based computer developed by Plaintiff *or Defendant* or in collaboration between Plaintiff and Defendant, or identified (internally or externally) as a CrunchPad, whether or not that conception version or prototype was publically exhibited.” (Emphasis added).

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick C. Doolittle